

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**MONIQUE DESHAYE STONUM**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CRIMINAL NO. 6:19-CR-154-3-ADA**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

TO: THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The undersigned submits this Report and Recommendation to the district judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Rule 1 of Appendix C of the Local Court Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges. Before the Court is the petition of the United States Probation Office recommending the revocation of the defendant's term of supervision. The district judge referred the matter to the undersigned for the preparation of a report and recommendation.

**I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

The defendant was convicted of Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute and Distribution of "Crack" Cocaine, a Schedule II Narcotic Drug Controlled Substance, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 {21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(C)}. She was sentenced to seventy-seven (77) months imprisonment, followed by a three (3) year term of supervised release. The defendant was released to supervision on May 07, 2024.

On April 22, 2025, the United States Probation Office filed a Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision alleging that the defendant violated the terms of her

supervision in the following way:

**Violation Number 1:** The defendant violated Mandatory Condition Number 2; the defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime, in that on or about April 13, 2025, the defendant was arrested for Manufacturing and Delivery of a Controlled Substance PG 1 4G<200 grams, in violation of Health and Safety Code 481.112, and Prohibited Substance/Item in a Correctional Facility, in violation of Penal Code 38.11, in Frio County, Texas.

On July 1, 2025, the Court held a hearing on the petition. At that hearing, the defendant plead NO CONTEST as to violation No. 1. The petition contained a sufficient factual basis to support the defendant's pleas of NO CONTEST.

## **II. FINDINGS OF THE COURT**

Based on the sworn statements of the defendant and other testimony at the hearing, the undersigned finds as follows:

1. The defendant violated the conditions of her supervision as alleged in the petition.
2. The defendant was competent to make the decision to enter a plea of NO CONTEST.
3. The defendant had both a factual and rational understanding of the proceedings against her.
4. The defendant did not suffer from any physical or mental impairment that would affect her ability to fully understand the charges against her or the consequences of her plea.
5. The defendant was not under the influence of any drugs, alcohol, or medication that would affect her judgment in entering a plea or that would affect her understanding of the basis, consequences, or effect of her plea.
6. The defendant was sane and mentally competent to stand trial for these proceedings.
7. The defendant was sane and mentally competent to assist her attorney in the preparation and conduct of her defense.

8. The defendant received a copy of the petition naming her, and she either read it or had it read to her.
9. The defendant understood the petition and the charges alleged against her.
10. The defendant had a sufficient opportunity to discuss the petition and charges with her attorney.
11. The defendant was satisfied with the job her attorney has done and had no complaints about her attorney.
12. The defendant understood that she had the right to plead NOT TRUE and proceed with a hearing at which she could present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.
13. The defendant freely, intelligently, and voluntarily entered her plea of NO CONTEST.
14. The defendant understood her statutory and constitutional rights and desired to waive them.
15. The petition contains a sufficient factual basis to support the defendant's plea NO CONTEST.

### **III. RECOMMENDATION**

The undersigned has carefully considered all the arguments and evidence presented by the parties and **RECOMMENDS** that the defendant's term of supervised release be revoked and that the defendant be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of twenty-one (21) months with no term of supervised release to follow and that she be given credit for the time she has already been in federal custody.

### **IV. WARNINGS**

The parties may file objections to this Report and Recommendation. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings or recommendations to which objections are

being made. The district court need not consider frivolous, conclusive, or general objections. *See Battles v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations contained in this Report within fourteen (14) days after the party is served with a copy of the Report shall bar that party from de novo review by the district judge of the proposed findings and recommendations in the Report and, except upon grounds of plain error, shall bar the party from appellate review of unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150-53 (1985); *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

SIGNED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2025.

  
DEREK T. GILLILAND  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE